2

REMARKS

In the Office Action, dated March 24, 2004, the Examiner states that Claims 1-25 are allowed. By the present Amendment, Applicants amend the claims.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-25 are objected to for a number of informalities. The Applicants could find no evidence of these informalities in Applicants' copy of the application. The undersigned attorney contacted the Examiner regarding these informalities. It was agreed that these informalities were most likely due to a scanning error which occurred when the application was scanned in electronic format by the USPTO. The Examiner agreed that the Applicants could resubmit a copy of the application and that no new matter objection would be raised. The undersigned attorney thanks the Examiner for his time in discussing this matter.

While resubmitting the application would be acceptable to the Appl cants, the Applicants would prefer that the originally submitted application be rescarned. The undersigned attorney also contacted Supervisory Examiner Johann Richter who indicated that the original applications are retained, and it would be possible to rescan the original application. If, however, the original application has been destroyed, the Applicants will gladly file another copy. The Applicants be ieve each of the objections will be overcome by rescanning the original application.

In reviewing the application, the Applicants have discovered a misspelling of the word "fluorene" in Claim 23, and correct this error by this amendment. No amendments relating to patentability have been made to the claims.

3

In light of the foregoing response, all the outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that this application should now be in better condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

June 2, 2004 Date

Attorney for Applicant Brian W. Hameder c/o Ladas & Parry

224 South Michigan Avenue Chicago, Illinois 60604

(312) 427-1300 Reg. No. 45613